

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,235	10/19/2001	Scott A. Rice	C01-02	7870
7590 11/18/2003		EXAMINER		
D. Michael Burns			DUONG, THANH P	
Acushnet Company 333 Bridge Street			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Fairhaven, MA			3711	$\overline{\gamma}$
			DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003	0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Advisory Action**

Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)	$-\tau$
10/038,235	RICE, SCOTT A.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Tom P Duong	3711	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued

Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
<ul> <li>a)</li></ul>	
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	n
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or	
<ul><li>(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.</li><li>NOTE:</li></ul>	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: as stated in Final Rejection.	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:  . STEPHEN BLAU  PRIMARY FXAMINER	

**Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)** 

Applicati n No.

The request for reconsideration is not persuasive. With respect to the face extension 74, Galloway discloses the importance of having such face extension to provide a smooth transition junction so that the welding zone is moved rearwardly not at the crown/face or face/sole, which will minimize stress at the junction upon ball's impact. Such configuration of the face extension improves COR while other prior art has no such face extension. One example of such prior art is USPN 5,954,596. USPN '596 (not applied in art rejection) also shows the transition junction (T3) between the face/crown and face/sole. With respect to the weight, Masghati '961 and Sun '408 shows weight(s) mounted directly behind the centerline of the shaft intersecting with the sole to reduce the tendency for the clubhead to rotate about the true axis. it is obvious in view of Masghati and Sun to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the weight feature of Masghati and/or Sun to improve the moment of inertia. (See Also USPN 5,310,186).